

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bay 149 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,963	03/27/2001	Klaus Lowack	GR 00 P 1583	9891
7590 11/17/2003			EXAMINER	
LERNER AND GREENBERG, P.A.			TALBOT, BRIAN K	
PATENT ATTORNEYS AND ATTORNEYS AT LAW Post office Box 2480			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480			1762	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

- · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary	09/817,963	LOWACK ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MANIENC DATE of this annual of	Brian K Talbot	1762			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (5) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period which is period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period which is statutory period with the properties of the statutory period with the statutory pe	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from Leause the application to become ABANDONET	ely filed swill be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133)			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 Au	igust 2003.				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ This a	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 4-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 4-7 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the d Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	pted or b)□ objected to by the E frawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some control None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. 					
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		PTO-413) Paper No(s) ttent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 1762

1. The amendment filed 8/25/03 has been considered and entered. Claims 1-3 have been canceled. Claims 4-7 remain in the application.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arbach et al. (5,021,129) in combination with Angelopoulos et al. (6,136,513) further in combination with Bickford et al. (5,800,858) still further in combination with either Schupp et al. (4,596,759), Beyne et al. (6,362,484 B1) or Conrod et al. (5,998,237).

Arbach et al. (5,021,129) teaches applying an electroactive layer (32) and then another electroactive layer (34). Patterning of the second layer (34) is performed to form areas (36). These areas (36) are then activated by seeding and then metallized to form conductive traces.

Angelopoulos et al. (6,136,513) teaches applying a photoresist layer to a substrate, treating the photoresist layer prior to applying a seed layer and another photoresist layer. The second photoresist layer is imaged and conductive traces are formed by metallization.

Therefore, it would have been within the skill of one practicing in the art to have modified Arbach et al. (5,021,129) process by implementing a "pretreatment step" as evidenced by Angelopoulos et al. (6,136,513) because of the advantages associated with such a step, i.e. reducing the amount of seeding utilized.

Application/Control Number: 09/817,963

Art Unit: 1762

In addition, it would have also been within the skill of one practicing in the art to have modified Angelopoulos et al. (6,136,513) process by forming and developing the second photoresist prior to applying the seed layer as evidenced by Arbach et al. (5,021,129) because of the expectation of achieving similar results as well as the fact that the amount of seed material utilized could be reduced due to the smaller area for which the seed is applied, i.e. no waste of seed material.

Arbach et al. (5,021,129) in combination with Angelopoulos et al. (6,136,513) fail to teach the thickness of the dielectric films being not greater than 50 microns (about 2.1 mils).

Bickford et al. (5,800,858) teaches a similar process whereby the thickness of the polymer films are from 0.3 to 5 mils in thickness which are imaged, developed and seeded prior to metallization. More than one layer of the polymer can be utilized with the layers being of the same polymeric material.

Therefore, one skilled in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of achieving similar success by modifying Arbach et al. (5,021,129) in combination with Angelopoulos et al. (6,136,513) process by utilizing the same polymeric material for the layers having a similar thickness as evidenced by Bickford et al. (5,800,858).

Arbach et al. (5,021,129) in combination with Angelopoulos et al. (6,136,513) further in combination with Bickford et al. (5,800,858) fail to teach the second insulating layer being a photosensitive material.

Schupp et al. (4,596,759), Beyne et al. (6,362,484 B1) or Conrod et al. (5,998,237) all teach utilizing photosensitive materials for forming electrical products. The photosensitive material is taught to be permanent and not removed from the substrate by a stripping step.

Application/Control Number: 09/817,963

Art Unit: 1762

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to have modified Arbach et al. (5,021,129) in combination with Angelopoulos et al. (6,136,513) further in combination with Bickford et al. (5,800,858) process by incorporating a photosensitive insulating layer as evidenced by Schupp et al. (4,596,759), Beyne et al. (6,362,484 B1) or Conrod et al. (5,998,237) because of the advantages associated with its use, i.e. no additional resist and stripping step is necessary.

With respect to claims 6 and 7, the claims recite "imaging" the first layer as well as the second layer. It is the Examiner's position that this has been shown to be conventional in the art and one skilled in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of achieving similar success and benefits associated with the steps.

Response to Amendment

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4-7 have been considered but are not found persuasive.

Applicant argued that the prior art failed to teach the claimed invention.

The Examiner disagrees. The combination of references teach a method for metalizing insulation layers, where a first insulation layer is activated, and a second insulation is embodied on the first activated insulation layer. The second insulation is subsequently structured so that partial areas of the first activated insulation layer are freed. The partial areas are subsequently

seeded and a metalization is then carried out on the embodied seeding. This is acknowledged by Applicant on pg. 10, first full paragraph).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K Talbot whose telephone number is (703) 305-3775. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6AM-3PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive P Beck can be reached on (703) 308-2333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3775.

B-talbot Brian K Talbot Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1762

BKT

November 13, 2003